

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

I. Status of the Claims

Claims 1-11 were previously canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claims 12-34 and 41-46 are withdrawn from consideration.

Claims 35, 39 and 40 are amended without the introduction of new matter.

Claims 12-46 are pending.

II. Objection to the Specification

The title of the invention was objected to as non-descriptive. In response, the title is amended as VIDEO-IMAGE CONTROL APPARATUS AND METHOD WITH IMAGE GENERATING MECHANISM, AND STORAGE MEDIUM CONTAINING THE VIDEO-IMAGE CONTROL PROGRAM. Applicants respectfully submit that the title is now clearly indicative of the invention.

III. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 35-40 were rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as anticipated by Ellenby et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,037,936, herein "Ellenby '936"). The Examiner also relied on Ellenby et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,815,411, herein "Ellenby '411") for his contention, which was incorporated by reference to Ellenby '936. Applicants respectfully traverse the above rejection.

Independent claim 35 is directed to an image processing apparatus, and amended to now include features that transmit to a client first internet page data including the object image and the additional image that is a link image which enables the client to start reception of second internet page data about the object from another network terminal which can provide information related to the object.

The cited reference Ellenby '936 describes superimposing a message 501 with an image of facade as shown in Figs. 50 and 51, and displaying another message 511 in response to the designation to the message 501.

However, according to Ellenby '936, both of the messages 501 and 511 are provided from a common service provider, but not provided from different service providers. Thus, Ellenby '916 fails to disclose, teach or suggest features that transmit to a client first internet page data including the object image and the additional image that is a link image which enables the client to start reception of second internet page data about the object *from another network terminal* which can provide information related to the object.

Therefore, amended claim 35 and claims 36-38 dependent therefrom are patentably distinguishable over the cited reference.

Amended independent claims 39 and 40 are also patentably distinguishable over the cited reference at least for the above reasons advanced for amended claim 35 to the extent that amended claims 39 and 40 each include features substantially similar to amended claim 35.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 35-40 based on Ellenby '936.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below if the Examiner believes any issue can be resolved through either a Supplemental Response or an Examiner's Amendment.

AUTHORIZATION

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for the timely consideration of this Amendment, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-4500, Order No. 1232-4407US1.

Dated: August 22, 2007

Respectfully submitted,



By _____
Hiroyuki Yasuda
Registration No.: 55,751
Morgan & Finnegan, L.L.P.
3 World Financial Center
(212) 415-8747
(212) 415-8701 Facsimile
Attorneys/Agents For Applicant